Application No.: 10/532,859

Amendment Rule 111 dated July 20, 2006 Reply to Office Action dated April 20, 2006

Attorney Docket No.: 0211-260

Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of the subject application as amended herein is requested.

Claims 1, 3, 15, 17, 28, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Krampl (U.S. Pat. No. Appl. 2003/0116402, granted as U.S. Pat. No. 6,814,215). Claims 1, 2, 15, 16, 28, 29, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Michel (FR 2663309 A1). Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Michel in view of Steeber (U.S. Pat. No. 5,601,180). Claims 18-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Michel in view of Hubbell (U.S. Pat. No. 2,523,829). Claims 22, 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Michel in view of Weeks (U.S. Pat. No. 4,475,648). Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Michel in view of both Weeks and Steeber. Claims 6, 24 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Michel in view of either Weeks or Steeber further in view of Kasai (U.S. Pat. No. 4,704, 772).

The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Briefly as defined in Claim 1, the present invention pertains to a conveyer. The conveyer is primarily intended for use in the food industry, but it not limited thereto. The conveyer is an improvement over prior art because it is formed using a single sheet of metal and requires substantially no welding or use of threaded fasteners. This improvement substantially eliminates small crevices in the structure where bacteria can build up and be difficult to remove. In addition to cutting down bacteria, the single sheet construction decreases the cost of cleaning the conveyor.

Claims 1, 3, 15, 17, 28, and 30 are not anticipated by Krampl. Krampl discloses only a supporting leg system and not the actual conveyer. The present invention involves construction of the belt platform of substantially a single sheet. In addition, Krampl does not disclose the

Application No.: 10/532,859

Amendment Rule 111 dated July 20, 2006 Reply to Office Action dated April 20, 2006

Attorney Docket No.: 0211-260

construction of a conveyer without welding. Specifically paragraphs 26, 29 and 30 of Krampl all involve welding in the construction of said support structure. Further, the front portion of figure 2, element 10 in Krampl is substantially horizontal. Claim 15 requires that substantially all of the exposed surfaces are inclined in use. For those reasons, the present invention is not anticipated by Krampl.

Claims 1, 2, 15, 16, 28, 29, and 30 are not anticipated by Michel. Michel does not disclose a conveyor constructed substantially of one sheet with no welds or threaded fasteners. In Michel, figure 4, elements 18, 20 and 26 are all separate parts which make up the conveyer. And in the Office action dated April 20, 2006 on page 4 at paragraph 8, the Examiner points out that Michel "does not expressly disclose... retaining means being free from welds, threaded fasteners, and surfaces which are horizontal in use." The afore-mentioned claims all include a limitation that the invention involves a conveyer where the entire structure is made from substantially one sheet of metal. Therefore, claims 1, 2, 15, 16, 28, 29, and 30 are not anticipated by Michel.

For the above-mentioned reasons, the three independent claims 1, 15 and 28 are patentable. Since, the remaining claims are all dependent claims based upon the independent claims, they are patentable as well.

It is respectfully submitted that the subject application is now in condition for allowance.

Applicant hereby states that by these amendments made hereinabove, no new matter is being added to the subject application.

Application No.: 10/532,859

Amendment Rule 111 dated July 20, 2006 Reply to Office Action dated April 20, 2006

Attorney Docket No.: 0211-260

Applicant respectfully requests entry into the record of the above amendments.

Dated: July 20, 2006

New York, New York

Respectfully submitted,

GOTTLIEB RACKMAN & REISMAN PC

Attorneys for Applicant 270 Madison Avenue

New York, New York 10016-0601

Telephone: (212) 684 3900 Telefax: (212) 684 3999

Bv:

WEISZ, Tiberiu Reg. No. 29,876

Enclosure(s): Patent Application Fee Determination Record
Multiple Dependent Claim Fee Calculation Sheet

S:\belinda\amend\rule111\markclerk\0211260.doc